

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,367
Docket No.: 13371-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lien et al (US 6682786). The Office Action also rejected claims 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lien et al (US 6682786) in view of Hachisu et al (US 2002/0113928).

Applicants submits that claims 1 and 4 are amended hereby; claim 3 is canceled hereby; and claims 2, and 5-7 are as originally filed. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-7 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lien et al (US 6682786). Applicant has amended claim 1, canceled claim 3, and left claims 2, 5-7 as originally filed, and hereby otherwise respectfully traverse the rejections. As such, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2 and 5-7 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

A reflective type liquid crystal micro display panel, being a liquid crystal on silicon (LCOS) display panel, comprising:

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,367
Docket No.: 13371-US-PA

an active component array substrate, the substrate being a silicon substrate...

Applicant submits that such a reflective type liquid crystal micro display panel as set forth in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Lien '786 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant acknowledges that Lien et al disclose a TFT display 10 comprising: an array of cells or pixels A; a display transparent electrode 16 of each pixel, all at the back side of the display 10; a common transparent electrode 17; a glass substrate 18; alignment layers 21, 22 disposed on the inner surface of the display and common electrodes 16 and 17, respectively; and a liquid crystal layer 23.

However, Lien et al do not teach that **the active component array substrate is a silicon substrate**. According to the principle of anticipation (MPEP §2131), Applicant submits that claim 1 should not be considered as being anticipated since **at least one element (active component array substrate being a silicon substrate) as set forth in the claim is not disclosed, either expressly or inherently described, in Lien et al '786.** (emphasis added)

Applicant notes that the Examiner rejected originally filed claim 3 as being disclosed by Lien '786 (column 4, Row 27-30) as "The active component array substrate comprises a glass substrate which is a silicon substrate". Hereby, claim 3 has been canceled and the content of the originally filed claim 3 has been added to the amended claim 1. Applicant would like to have the

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,367
Docket No.: 13371-US-PA

Examiner to reconsider Lien '786 (column 4, Row 27-30) that is **"Parallel with the outside of the common electrode 17 and adjacent glass substrate 18 is a polarizer, which is appropriately orientated relative the polarizer 20 mounted in back of the rear substrate 13."** Although Lien et al teach a glass substrate 18 somehow, there is no evidence supporting a disclosure of a silicon substrate in Lien '786 either expressly or inherently. One of ordinary skill in the art should understand that silicon itself can not exist as a glass and it exists only in crystalline types, either polycrystalline type or monocrystalline type. Therefore, the glass substrate 18 disclosed in Lien '786 is different from and teach away the silicon substrate of the present invention. Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted to be novel, unobvious, and patentable over Lien.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed.

Claims 2 and 5-7 depends from claim 1, and therefore should also be allowable.

The Office Action rejected claims 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lien et al (US 6682786) in view of Hachisu et al (US 2002/0113928).

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and therefore should also be allowable.


Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,367
Docket No.: 13371-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1, 2, and 4-7 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : Jan. 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@icpgroup.com.tw
Usa@icpgroup.com.tw